

REMARKS

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Section 112 rejections were overcome by the amendments and arguments presented in the Amendment filed on December 12, 2007.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 9, 12-14 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0048035 to Beaudet et al. ("Beaudet") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,845,078 to Tezuka et al. ("Tezuka").

The Examiner again cites Beaudet, mainly paragraphs 0040 and 0041 and Figures 4D and 4E, as disclosing all of the claimed features except the change of state of the display of any interrupt key. Paragraph 0008 is cited for running plural jobs and interrupting one to run another.

Beaudet is applied substantially as it was in the last Action. In our Amendment filed December 17, 2007, Applicants noted, *inter alia*, that whereas a displayed an interrupt key disappeared when selected, in the present invention it continued to be displayed, but changed its state.

The Examiner focuses on this change of state of the displayed interrupt button, cites a new reference to Tezuka for this feature, and argues that it would be obvious for one to use an interrupt button that changes its state, as disclosed in Tezuka, instead of one that disappears, as in Beaudet. The Examiner cites Col. 64, line 53 to Col. 65, line 25 as disclosing a change of state of a key (shown in different states in Figs. 100-105) corresponding to various bit map options (Fig. 99) for the state of a given key.

In response, Applicants first note that Tezuka deals with a very different technical problem, the setting up of a network such as a P.C. LAN. Tezuka has nothing to do with running multiple jobs on a copier.

Second, and importantly, the art of record does not provide a reason to combine Beaudet and Tezuka. Beaudet eliminates the interrupt key entirely. It is not clear why, without the hindsight benefit of the present invention, one would change Beaudet to use a change of display state of the interrupt key.

One feature of the present invention is that "after the detail setting key is pressed down, the interruption key remains to be displayed and, meanwhile, a display state thereof is changed." Such an arrangement is not disclosed in Beaudet, as admitted by the Examiner. In Beaudet, the interruption key is eliminated after pressing down the detail setting key. This arrangement is totally different from the present invention. Therefore, even if Tezuka discloses an arrangement such that "a key remains to be displayed and, meanwhile, a display state of the key is changed," such an arrangement is contradictory to the idea of the elimination of the interruption key, the idea disclosed in Beaudet. Accordingly, a person skilled in the art would not combine the contradictory arrangements of Beaudet and Tezuka.

Third, Applicants do not find a teaching that Tezuka discloses that the change of state key changes its display state in connection with its selection, and certainly not in connection with the activation of an interrupt key which initiates a pop-up of detail settings for a different copy job to be run under control from the same GUI as a previous copy job. In other words, there is no indication that Tezuka teaches or suggests the particular claimed change of display state. There also appears to be no teaching or suggestion of use of a change in display state of a key in conjunction with a detail setting pop-up to avoid operator confusion.

Fourth, in Tezuka where an interrupt button is described, e.g. Col. 27, line 57 et seq., in connection with Figs. 25 and 29, actuation of an interrupt button causes a window (Fig. 29) to display for confirmation of the interrupt. Pressing "OK" transfers control to a different window. See also Col. 30, line 37 et seq. as well as a discussion of the use of two levels of confirmation (Col. 31, lines 41-61).

Fifth, the passage cited by the Examiner deals with the bit maps (Fig. 99) for each button, not how a change of state of the displayed button relates to any co-displayed detail settings or pop-ups.

Sixth, the Examiner again relies on Figs. 4A-4K of Beaudet as teaching our claimed pop-up detail setting changes with a co-displayed interrupt key. For the reasons noted earlier, Applicant do not agree that the cited Figures and passages in Beaudet teach or suggest these features.

Applicants also respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 USC Section 103(a) of claims 7, 8, 10, 11 and 15 as obvious over Beaudet when combined with Tezuka and further combined with Japanese Publication 03175065 to Sato et al. (claims 7 and 8), U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0050996 to Hirayama (claims 10 and 11) or U.S. Patent No. 6,385,412 to Sadakumi (claim 5). While these tertiary references show isolated features, they do not supply the deficiencies noted above with respect to Beaudet, Tezuka, and the combination of Beaudet and Tezuka.

In view of the foregoing Remarks, Applicants believes the pending claims are clearly allowable over the art of record, whether considered alone or in any combination, and that this application is otherwise in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Peter J. Manus

Registration No.: 26,766

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, Massachusetts 02205

(617) 517-5530

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant